United Nations A/68/813

General Assembly

Distr.: General
26 March 2014

Original: English

Sixty-eighth session
Agenda item 147
Administrative and budgetary aspects of the financing of the United Nations peacekeeping operations

Results of the revised survey to establish the standard rate of reimbursement to troop-contributing countries, as approved by the General Assembly in its resolution 67/261 on the report of the Senior Advisory Group on rates of reimbursement to troop-contributing countries

Report of the Secretary-General

I. Introduction

1. In its resolution 67/261, the General Assembly approved the conclusions and recommendations of the Senior Advisory Group, as summarized in section IV of its report on rates of reimbursement to troop-contributing countries and related issues (A/C.5/67/10). Central to the recommendations of the Senior Advisory Group was the use of a revised methodology to collect data from troop- and police-contributing countries on the common, additional and essential costs they incur when deploying uniformed personnel to United Nations peacekeeping operations.

II. Background

2. The Senior Advisory Group was established by the General Assembly in its resolution 65/289 to consider rates of reimbursement to troop-contributing countries and related issues. Its establishment came after six months of intense intergovernmental negotiations over the standard rate of reimbursement. In establishing the Senior Advisory Group, the Assembly recognized the importance of the rate of personnel reimbursement to the wider peacekeeping partnership and its centrality to peacekeeping budgets and finance. The General Assembly convened the Senior Advisory Group in recognition of the challenges it faced in putting in place an effective, transparent and equitable system for the regular review of the rate of personnel reimbursement to contributing countries.

14-27832 (E) 100414

Please recycle

3. The recommendations of the Senior Advisory Group were concerned primarily with the reimbursement framework. In addition, in paragraphs 118 to 120 of its report, the Senior Advisory Group also made a number of recommendations related to peacekeeping policy that do not have direct budgetary implications. In keeping with the initial report of the Secretary-General on the recommendations of the Senior Advisory Group (A/67/713), progress regarding the implementation of those recommendations will be reported to the General Assembly through the Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations.

III. The current reimbursement framework

4. The current personnel reimbursement system has three distinct elements: the standard rate for "pay and allowances" of $1,028 per month per person; a supplementary payment for "specialists" of $303 per month that is automatically applied to 25 per cent of personnel in a logistics unit and 10 per cent of personnel in an infantry battalion; an amount of $68 per month for each contingent member in respect of personal clothing, gear and equipment; and $5 monthly amount as a usage factor for personal weaponry. Since 2011, an annual supplementary ad hoc payment has been made to contributing countries. In 2011/12 and 2012/13, the supplementary payment was met from savings and efficiencies within the peacekeeping budgets. For the year 2013/14, the supplementary payment amounted to 6.75 per cent of the base rate of $1,028, or an additional $69 per person.

5. The total amount budgeted for personnel reimbursement for the year 2013/14, comprising all standard personnel reimbursements (pay and allowances, specialist supplement, personal kit and equipment, and weaponry, as well as the ad hoc and supplementary payment) totals $1.33 billion, with an average per person per month amount of approximately $1,210 paid per contingent personnel member.

6. In addition to the existing categories of reimbursement (allowances and personal kit and equipment, including weaponry), the revised survey methodology requested data on three new categories of troop- and police-contributing country expenditures: inland transportation, predeployment medical; and United Nations-specific predeployment training.

7. The General Assembly has also established additional direct payments to individual contingent troops and police: a daily allowance of $1.28 established in 1974; and $10.50 per day for 15 days for recreational leave, which was updated in 2009. These direct payments from the United Nations are not reimbursements to troop-contributing countries. In paragraph 99 of its report, the Senior Advisory Group noted that the daily allowance had not been revised for nearly 40 years and that the General Assembly may wish to revise the level of this allowance. Table 1 provides an overview of the current personnel reimbursement amounts.

Table 1
Standard reimbursement system

	Amount (United States dollars)	*Date of most recent adjustment*
Paid to troop-contributing countries (per month per person)		
Pay and allowances	1 028.00	2002
Supplementary pay for specialists	303.00	2002
Usage factor for personal clothing, gear and equipment	68.00	2002
Usage factor for personal weaponry	5.00	2002
Direct payments to individual contingent members (per day per contingent member)		
Daily allowance	1.28	1974
Recreational leave allowance (15 days)	10.50	2009

8. In paragraphs 14 and 15 of its report, the Senior Advisory Group highlighted the degree to which peacekeeping has evolved, pointing out that United Nations peacekeeping operations are more diverse than ever, and that their mandates were highly complex and covered a broad range of political, security and peacebuilding goals. The Senior Advisory Group also pointed out that this evolution had placed increased demands on the United Nations and its troop and police contributors, whereby the task of generating qualified personnel and sustaining, equipping and financing them was formidable. In its observations on the current system of personnel reimbursement, in paragraph 80 of its report, the Senior Advisory Group highlighted the following: the existing personnel reimbursement framework had not been significantly reviewed since 1974 and the separate payments it includes do not necessarily correspond with contemporary operational requirements; and the current framework does not distinguish between types of missions or the risk levels assumed by countries contributing forces to those missions, nor is it designed to ensure that United Nations operations have the right kinds of military expertise at their disposal. The Senior Advisory Group further observed that some of the individual elements did not achieve their purpose. The Senior Advisory Group also pointed out that the specialist supplement does not reimburse for specialties as such, but compensates countries for a fixed proportion of individuals of higher rank, and that the current separation of the two personal kit elements ($68 usage factor for personal clothing, gear and equipment and $5 for personal weaponry, as outlined in table 1) reflects the fragmented evolution of the reimbursement system.

9. At the core of the recommendations of the Senior Advisory Group adopted by the General Assembly is the goal of establishing an effective, transparent and equitable system to regularly review the rate of personnel reimbursement to countries contributing uniformed personnel to United Nations peacekeeping, and that this system should be based on actual data on the common, additional and essential costs incurred by countries contributing troops. The underlying principles for the system and the data collection exercise framework, re-articulated by the General Assembly in its adoption of the recommendations of the Senior Advisory

Group, are: simplicity, equity, transparency, comprehensiveness, portability, financial control and audit and confirmed delivery of specified services.

10. In this regard, according to the Senior Advisory Group, the report of the Secretariat on the survey data is a fundamental part of the new system approved by the General Assembly in resolution 67/261. The purpose of the survey data is to assist the Assembly in making an informed decision on the rate of reimbursement. The Secretary-General has not been requested to make a recommendation on the actual rate of reimbursement.

11. In approving the recommendation by the Senior Advisory Group to introduce two premium payments in addition to the standard rate of reimbursement, the General Assembly recognized that the reimbursement structure could also support changing operational circumstances. In particular, in approving payments for enabling capacities that necessarily require a combination of personnel and equipment, the resolution recognizes the operational link between equipment and personnel. The possible deductions to personnel reimbursement on the basis of absent or non-functioning major equipment also requires closer integration between the two systems. This fundamental operational relationship should be better integrated across the Secretariat's own systems for reimbursing troop- and police-contributing countries.

IV. Revised survey methodology

12. As noted by the Senior Advisory Group in its report, the United Nations has struggled to put in place a system to regularly collect, analyse and review the costs incurred by Member States in contributing contingent personnel. Previous survey attempts have encountered multiple problems, and no survey has been conducted and reported to the General Assembly since 1996 (see A/54/763). The survey process approved by the General Assembly in its resolution 67/261 was designed to address the flaws noted in previous attempts, most recently the methodology approved by the General Assembly in 2009 in its resolution 63/285 (see A/60/725/Add.1). In adopting its resolution 67/261 approving the recommendations of the Senior Advisory Group, the General Assembly replaced the survey process approved in 2009, which was never completed. In that it is a pared down and simplified version of the questionnaire approved in 2009, the new survey represents an evolution from the previous approach. The problems identified and the measures introduced to overcome them are summarized below:

(a) Low response rate: in paragraph 57 of its report, the Senior Advisory Group describes how, more than two years after the launch of the 2009 survey approved by the Assembly in its resolution 63/289, only 25 countries out of a total sample size of 84 had responded. In 2011, only 15 out of a total sample size of 73 submitted responses. The process approved by the Assembly in its resolution 67/261, and reported on in the present report, worked with a smaller and more targeted sample of 10 representative countries. The survey yielded a 100 per cent response rate;

(b) Incomplete data: questionnaires received as part of the previous survey were largely incomplete, with many responses containing no data in entire sections. The inconsistency of information made analysis and comparison very difficult and called into question the empirical validity of some of the data. In the process

described in the present report, all 10 questionnaires were complete in all sections, and those areas requiring clarification and verification were addressed through the interactive follow-up process;

(c) Relevance and complexity: the previous survey requested information about regular military pay, which is not an additional cost related to United Nations peacekeeping. It also did not solicit any cost data about training, which is an essential and additional operational investment made by contributing countries. At over 60 pages in length, the questionnaire also requested a great deal of highly technical information, and feedback from contributing countries indicated that it was very hard to understand. The revised survey applied the principle of simplicity in reducing the level of detail required in the questionnaire and gave the opportunity for clarification and review through the follow-up dialogue between the sample countries and the Secretariat;

(d) Timeframe: the previous survey, approved by the Assembly in its resolution 63/285, aimed to establish a baseline over a four-year period. The length of this survey process and the delay in reporting results contributed to the frustration expressed by troop- and police-contributing countries to the 2011 Working Group (see A/C.5/65/16, paras. 33-38) on contingent-owned equipment and the Fifth Committee (A/C.5/65/SR.33). The revised survey process lasted six months from the selection of the sample countries to the presentation of data;

(e) Feedback: the Senior Advisory Group observed that the previous survey process, as approved by the General Assembly in its resolution 63/289, did not provide any proactive assistance to troop- and police-contributing countries in completing the questionnaire and that it lacked a human element to assist responding countries in putting together meaningful information. In the current survey, each sample country was assigned a focal point, and regular briefings were held with the sample countries. Visits to the sample countries were a key part of the survey methodology. The process of working closely with the sample countries has resulted in the provision of data that is clearer and more consistent, as well as an improved understanding between the sample countries and the Secretariat about the reimbursement framework.

Sample

13. As approved by the General Assembly in its resolution 67/261, the sample of 10 countries was drawn from the top 20 contributors over the prior three-year period (2010-2012); included, in proportion to overall troop contributions, countries from four broad income categories (high, upper middle, lower middle and low, based on World Bank data and classification); together comprised a collective minimum of 50 per cent of troop and police contributions over the prior three-year period; and were willing to provide the required data with the assistance of the survey team.

14. In establishing the sample, interest was solicited from the 20 eligible Member States. A process of briefings and meetings was undertaken to establish the final 10 countries to participate in the process. Seven of the 10 countries contribute formed police units as well as military contingents. In accordance with the approved recommendations of the Senior Advisory Group, the final list was communicated to the President of the General Assembly by the Secretary-General in a letter dated 25 October 2013.

Table 2
Sample countries participating in the personnel cost survey 2013/14

Country	*Percentage contribution 2010-2012*	*Income category*
Bangladesh	11.05	Low
Pakistan	10.91	Lower middle
India	9.28	Lower middle
Nigeria	6.04	Lower middle
Egypt	5.14	Lower middle
Nepal	4.50	Low
Rwanda	4.09	Low
Uruguay	2.60	Upper middle
Brazil	2.42	Upper middle
Italy	1.79	High
Total	**57.82**	

Data

15. As mandated by the approval of the General Assembly of the recommendations of the Senior Advisory Group, data was collected about five categories of common, additional and essential costs incurred by countries in deploying to peacekeeping: (a) allowances; (b) personal kit and equipment (including personal weaponry); (c) predeployment medical expenses; (d) inland transportation; and (e) United Nations-specific predeployment training. Sample countries were also asked to report on any other costs. The data presented in table 3 includes only those mandated categories.

16. The data was collected for an identical time period to allow for comparability. Costs were requested in the currency in which they were incurred, and the United Nations operational rate of exchange was applied. The questionnaire requested information based on troop and police deployment for March 2013. This approach provided a "snapshot" of deployment costs for a set period in the previous financial year, allowing sample countries to report on actual expenses incurred at a specific point in time. March 2013 was selected because it was within the most recent financial year, and yet a sufficient period of time in the past to allow sample countries to provide actual costs based on prior expenditure.

17. The questionnaire requested separate data about the costs associated with deployment of formed police units. The first United Nations formed police unit was deployed in 2001. Since the current base rate was established in 2002 through an ad hoc increase approved by the General Assembly in its resolution 55/274, formed police unit costs have never been included in cost data surveys. The presentation of the data in the present report includes costs for formed police units in the overall aggregate amounts. In March 2013, the total deployment of formed police units was 12,936, as compared with 82,395 for contingent military personnel. The data collected as part of the process reported in the present document also includes information on the amount and number of overseas allowances and other costs paid

to senior officers, for both military and police. These costs are incorporated into the average per person monthly costs for each category.

Method

18. In its resolution 67/261, the General Assembly approved a revised approach to data collection that would link the data-collection process more closely with analysis. Following this methodology, the data presented in the present report was generated through a pared down and simplified questionnaire that was based on the questionnaire previously approved by the General Assembly in its resolution 65/289, followed by a more focused set of questions to allow a more meaningful and analytical review.

19. Central to the interactive approach were follow-up visits to participating countries. Between November 2013 and February 2014, Secretariat-led teams comprising the required military, police and budgetary expertise visited all 10 countries. The visits were an essential part of the methodology, allowing for the review and revision, as needed, of the data requested in the questionnaire and to ensure full understanding of the costs presented. After the completion of this interactive process, the most senior financial official of the ministry of defence or interior signed off on the revised questionnaire.

20. Following the finalization of all 10 questionnaires, the data was reviewed to ensure completeness and comprehensiveness to ensure that all relevant information provided by the sample countries was properly understood. In analysing the information, the primary consideration was to ensure that the costs captured were specific to peacekeeping and directly applicable to the deployment of personnel from the sample countries. The data was analysed in terms of the actual costs incurred by the sample countries in relation to the survey period. Although the data, in particular those on allowances, clearly indicate a relationship between the current rate of reimbursement and the costs incurred by troop-contributing countries, the survey was not designed to assess how the current reimbursement amounts are being used.

21. Throughout the survey process, the overarching principle of "common, additional and essential", identified by the General Assembly in its resolution 55/274 and reiterated in resolution 67/261, was applied to determine costs associated specifically with contributions to United Nations peacekeeping.

22. A Technical Expert Reference Panel of five experts with a range of financial, military and police experience worked with the Secretariat to advise on the process and to ensure that the methodology was followed and that the data was, as far as possible, complete, consistent and credible and in accordance with the instructions. The Panel also discussed in detail with the Secretariat survey teams the results obtained, particularly in areas with high variances. On the basis of its detailed review of the process, the Panel confirmed that the methodology had been consistently applied and that the data collection and analysis process was sound. In their considerations, where relevant and applicable, the Panel also reviewed the data against other sources of information, including open source data and United Nations-specific information, for example, the medical services manual and the United Nations core predeployment training modules. In its view, the data presented is credible and clear. In addition, it noted that the revised methodology had led to clearer data and an improved response rate.

A. Presentation of cost data

23. In paragraphs 71 and 72 of its report, the Senior Advisory Group stated that the data collected from each of the sample countries would be collated and that the aggregated costs would be presented by category (i.e., allowances, personal kit and equipment, predeployment medical expenses, in-country travel and training) for each country. The overall monthly cost for each sample country would also be presented, and this approach would allow the General Assembly to get a full picture of the costs in each of the representative countries rather than an average or median cost figure.

24. Noting the legitimate concerns of participating countries about the confidentiality and sensitivity of the data, the recommendations of the Senior Advisory Group stressed that individual countries should not be identified in the presentation of the data. In accordance with this approach, the data presented in the present report is anonymous. In the tables below, the sample countries are designated by letters A through J. Those designations are used consistently throughout the report (country A is always country A). Throughout the process, all information given by the sample countries was handled with complete confidentiality, with only the core Secretariat survey team seeing all the attributed data.

Sample weighting issues

25. As outlined in paragraph 21 above, the sampling parameters addressed problems with previous surveys, notably the low rate of response and the lack of completeness and consistency in the data submitted. The sample countries participated voluntarily, and the sampling methodology allowed for participation from the different income categories to reflect the different nature and cost structures of the universe of troop-contributing countries. The sample represents more than 50 per cent of contributions from the three previous years and is broadly representative of the types of countries contributing to peacekeeping. However, because it is self-selecting and not random, it may not, strictly speaking, be statistically representative. It does, however, meet the mandated requirements laid down by the General Assembly in its acceptance of the recommendations of the Senior Advisory Group.

26. The Senior Advisory Group recommended that the presentation of data be collated and the aggregated costs presented by category for each country and that the overall monthly cost for each sample country also be presented so that the General Assembly would get a full picture of the costs in each of the representative countries. The survey data is presented as such in table 3. Each of the 10 countries represents a different percentage of contribution to United Nations peacekeeping and to the overall sample itself. A simple average across the 10 sample countries would exaggerate the total costs incurred by the sample countries. Accordingly, paragraphs 28, 34, 40, 50, 55 and 59 below also give weighted cost data. The weighting reflects the percentage contribution of each of the 10 countries as a proportion of the overall sample population. The weighted average across all five cost categories, which reflects the proportionate size of the contributions of troop contributors, would amount to $1,762.55 per person per month.

27. Tables 3, 5, 6, 7, 8 and 9 present only the aggregated costs from each sample country and by category: peacekeeping-specific allowances; personal kit and equipment (including weaponry); predeployment medical expenses, inland transportation, and peacekeeping-specific training.

Table 3
Summary of the 10 countries and five categories of data

	Average per person monthly amount (United States dollars) by category									
Sample country	*A*	*B*	*C*	*D*	*E*	*F*	*G*	*H*	*I*	*J*
Allowances	1 075.26	7 820.61	1 108.08	1 827.63	1 119.47	1 439.29	1 083.93	2 280.80	1 207.73	989.41
Personal kit and equipment	236.79	61.83	200.68	259.23	113.11	123.82	197.21	131.17	199.97	136.57
Predeployment medical	59.82	89.41	68.88	78.28	63.43	60.27	37.15	58.45	43.80	54.80
Inland transportation	0.29	1.06	24.70	100.05	13.96	9.34	5.87	24.60	12.53	21.48
United Nations-specific predeployment training	101.17	244.16	138.21	162.41	151.35	87.27	275.86	169.68	156.87	101.39
Total (per person per month)	**1 473.33**	**8 217.07**	**1 540.56**	**2 427.61**	**1 461.32**	**1 719.99**	**1 600.01**	**2 664.70**	**1 620.91**	**1 303.65**

28. As noted in paragraph 6 above, three of the categories presented above are additions to the reimbursement framework (inland transportation, predeployment medical and United Nations-specific predeployment training). These newly captured costs represent 13 per cent of the total weighted average figure of $1,762.55. Without these additional categories, the weighted average monthly cost per person would amount to $1,536.23.

29. As highlighted by the Senior Advisory Group in paragraph 14 of its report, peacekeeping has changed significantly since the last survey of cost data. Not only have the mandated tasks grown more complex but the mission environments are, in many cases, more hostile with increased health risks. In response to those changes, over the past two decades the United Nations has placed increasing demands on troop- and police-contributing countries through, inter alia, more rigorous standards for predeployment medical clearance and an increased focus on training. The Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations, in its report on its 2012 substantive session, reiterated the importance of training and providing peacekeeping personnel with adequate equipment to fulfil the mandate in accordance with United Nations standards as key factors in preventing casualties and in ensuring the safety and security of peacekeepers. In the same report, the Special Committee also highlighted the importance of establishing medical standards. In consultation with troop- and police-contributing countries, the Secretariat is finalizing a revised medical support manual that includes enhanced predeployment requirements. The previous medical support manual was issued in 1999. The addition of these categories in the revised questionnaire reflects the expectations of the United Nations from troop- and police-contributing countries.

30. In line with the approved methodology and on the basis of the recommendation to maintain a standard per-person rate, the data was collated and aggregated to establish average monthly per-person per month costs over the course of the deployment length for each category and overall. The data, in each category, is weighted to reflect the actual number and type of deployed personnel so, for example, any higher allowances paid to senior officers, are aggregated to reflect the total number of officers at that rank. However, for at least two of the cost categories, the costs are not incurred on a monthly basis. In the case of training costs, the

investment in planning, developing and providing predeployment preparation for United Nations peacekeeping can be a permanent activity that requires significant capital expenditure and ongoing running costs. Table 4 gives the one-time costs of United Nations-specific predeployment training, as an illustration of one of the up-front investments made by contributing countries.

Table 4
One-time costs for United Nations-specific predeployment training

Sample country	*Total cost of training per deployment (United States dollars)*
A	3 690 401
B	1 583 595
C	6 889 534
D	2 084 353
E	14 460 576
F	1 486 925
G	14 654 687
H	4 988 683
I	4 378 238
J	10 323 524

Cost data: general observations

31. Since the inception of the personnel reimbursement framework, the wide variations in troop costs among troop-contributing countries has been recognized. It has also been recognized that, in some cases, the standard rates would not fully compensate troop-contributing countries for all of the costs they incurred (A/9825/Add.2, para. 15). Countries contributing troops and police to United Nations peacekeeping operations do so voluntarily and, throughout the survey process, the sample countries demonstrated their commitment to United Nations peacekeeping and reported a range of positive benefits associated with their participation in United Nations operations.

32. In reviewing the cost data, it is also important to consider the different history of contributions to peacekeeping among sample countries as well as the varied national systems and approaches to generating and sustaining troops and police. In some of the sample countries, the process of generating troops is organic, with existing units being trained and prepared for peacekeeping deployment. In others, the process generates composite units, with considerable time spent on bringing together personnel from different units, or even service branches. In the case of police, the units do not, in most cases, exist organically and are brought together specifically for service in United Nations peacekeeping, requiring considerably longer predeployment lead times and preparation. The range and variety of national systems and approaches is reflected in the different costs reported.

33. The General Assembly approved five categories of costs identified as common, additional and essential. Investment by the sample countries in those categories is not always easy to isolate from general military/police expenses. Inevitably costs were incurred that, while they were spent in relation to peacekeeping, also benefit

more general military or police deployment. In some cases, overlaps exist between and among the cost categories; for example, with kit and equipment being specifically issued for training periods or travel related to training. Throughout the survey process, the Secretariat teams worked with the sample countries to isolate, as far as possible, specific costs. To this end, various peripheral and overhead costs have not been reflected in the data presented, for example ongoing backstopping support costs, such as translation of materials.

Cost data: allowances

Table 5
Allowances

Sample country	*Allowances per person monthly amount (United States dollars)*
A	1 075.26
B	7 820.61
C	1 108.08
D	1 827.63
E	1 119.47
F	1 439.29
G	1 083.93
H	2 280.80
I	1 207.73
J	989.41

34. Table 5 provides an overall average amount per person per month in each sample country for allowances paid to personnel specific to their service in United Nations peacekeeping by each sample country. Costs associated with regular domestic pay and allowances were not included. Of note, the cost of allowances comprises over three quarters of the overall costs incurred by contributing countries. **The weighted average costs across all 10 sample countries would amount to $1,367.89 per person per month. Allowances constitute 77.61 per cent of the total costs incurred across the 10 sample troop- and police-contributing countries.**

35. In keeping with the approved methodology, table 5 includes data on the amount and type of overseas allowances and other costs paid to senior officers. The questionnaire requested detailed information about any allowances paid to specialized personnel, such as aviation, naval or engineering, and for any allowance specific to senior ranks. Specific information was also requested about the allowances paid to formed police units, including any specialist allowances.

36. Some variation exists in the type of and approach to determining additional allowances paid for service in United Nations peacekeeping. Many countries reported a flat rate allowance, linked to the current reimbursement rate. The majority of the sample countries set their allowances in relation to the standard United Nations rate, with a form of "pass-through" payment to contingents to the standard monthly base rate of $1,028. In addition, some countries also pay a one-off

deployment allowance or an additional incentive for specialties in high demand, such as medical skills. Although outside of the timeframe of the data collection, one country also reported that it had recently introduced an additional allowance for women police officers, to encourage greater participation.

37. In the more detailed discussion with sample countries about the rate of allowances, a number of factors would seem to influence the payment of allowances. One is the standard rate of United Nations reimbursement itself (since the current base rate was established in 2002 and is well known to participating personnel). Another factor, in some cases, is national legislation that determines the amount and type of allowance that uniformed personnel must be paid when on overseas service. In general, allowances increase with seniority, but in some sample countries the allowance structure is relatively flat.

Cost data: personal kit and equipment

Table 6
Personal kit and equipment

Sample country	*Personal kit, equipment and weaponry, per person monthly amount (United States dollars)*
A	236.79
B	61.83
C	200.68
D	259.23
E	113.11
F	123.82
G	197.21
H	131.17
I	199.97
J	136.57

38. Table 6 gives an average monthly amount per person for the costs incurred in providing individual contingents with personal kit and equipment, including a personal weapon. The monthly cost represents the total average amount per person amortized over the deployment period. Again, the different national systems in place have an impact on the cost structure of kitting and equipping personnel.

39. The questionnaire provided the standard list of personal kit and equipment specified in annex II of the Contingent-owned Equipment Manual. Sample countries were asked to give an average cost per person. Details were also requested of any additional costs incurred in equipping female contingents or police officers. In the follow-up questions and survey visits, more detail was requested on how the costs were established, including the application of depreciation as well as the national systems and processes in place to equip soldiers and/or police. The majority of sample countries issue an entirely new set of items on deployment with the United Nations. While noting some overlap between regular service items and kit, in most cases sample countries issue new personal kit and personal equipment items (such as sleeping bags or water canteens) to contingents being deployed to United Nations

peacekeeping. In some cases, technical specialists were issued with more specialized kits, with increased costs.

40. While the list annexed to the memorandum of understanding is standard, table 6 reflects the quite significant variations in costs among the sample countries. A number of factors need to be considered, including different national production capacities and procurement systems. In most sample countries, the costs of standard items are established through a central process that reflects market surveys and tendering based on both price and quality. **The weighted average cost across all 10 countries for this category would amount to $168.33 (9.55 per cent of the overall cost across the sample countries) per person per month.**

Cost data: predeployment medical

Table 7
Predeployment medical

Sample country	*Predeployment medical, per person monthly amount (United States dollars)*
A	59.82
B	89.41
C	68.88
D	78.28
E	63.43
F	60.27
G	37.15
H	58.45
I	43.80
J	54.80

41. Table 7 gives an average monthly amount per person for costs incurred in providing predeployment medical examinations, tests and vaccinations. The monthly cost represents the total average amount per person amortized over the deployment period (either 6, 9 or 12 months). Many sample countries have in place extensive processes and systems to manage the predeployment medical requirements of a large number of personnel deployed to peacekeeping, which require additional administrative investments and overheads. **The weighted average across all 10 countries for this category would amount to $58.87 (3.34 per cent of the overall cost across the sample countries) per person per month.**

42. The questionnaire provided a list of standard examinations, tests and X-rays based on the standard United Nations medical services form. As these standards are considered mandatory for deployment to United Nations peacekeeping, these medical costs are common, additional and essential to United Nations peacekeeping. A number of sample countries also provided the costs of additional exams or tests, including predeployment psychological evaluations, not included in the medical manual. Since it is of direct benefit to the United Nations for troops and police to be in good health, these costs were included in the overall amounts. It should also be noted that the United Nations directly reimburses contributing countries for yellow

fever and Japanese encephalitis through separate arrangements under reimbursement for contingent-owned equipment. The General Assembly may wish to consider moving those costs into the personnel framework.

43. While the questionnaire explicitly asked for costs associated with predeployment medical requirements, sample countries also observed that they incurred costs associated with medical examinations and procedures post-deployment that were specific to service in United Nations peacekeeping operations, including psychological examinations and counselling. The General Assembly may wish to consider including peacekeeping-specific, post-deployment medical expenses in future survey exercises.

Cost data: inland transportation

Table 8
Inland transportation

Sample country	*Inland transportation (United States dollars)*
A	0.29
B	1.06
C	24.70
D	100.05
E	13.96
F	9.34
G	5.87
H	24.60
I	12.53
J	21.48

44. Table 8 provides an average monthly amount per person for costs incurred in moving a contingent, once ready to deploy, to the point of disembarkation to the United Nations peacekeeping operation. The monthly cost represents the total average amount per person amortized over the deployment period. In line with the methodology to use an identical time period (or "snapshot"), the costs presented are specifically in relation to the transportation costs of moving those troops and police in missions in March 2013.

45. In providing their data, a number of countries also gave information about the cost of travel related to bringing contingents/police for United Nations-specific training. These costs were disaggregated and added to the training costs. In the follow-up process, the survey teams requested additional information regarding the basis of calculations to arrive at the average cost per person.

46. Table 8 provides a range of costs associated with inland transportation that reflects the considerable diversity within the sample countries in terms of size, terrain and infrastructure, as well as the different national systems in place for generating troops and police. The United Nations requirement for one point of embarkation also had an impact in terms of requiring inland movement of personnel, both in terms of mobilization and demobilization of personnel. The questionnaire

requested information on only the mobilization costs of deployment and not demobilization. **The weighted average costs across all 10 countries for this category would amount to $19.15 (1.09 per cent of the overall cost across the sample countries) per person per month.**

Cost data: United Nations peacekeeping-specific training

Table 9
United Nations-specific predeployment training

Sample country	*United Nations-specific predeployment training (United States dollars)*
A	101.17
B	244.16
C	138.21
D	162.41
E	151.35
F	87.27
G	275.86
H	169.68
I	156.87
J	101.39

47. Over the past four years, the United Nations has made considerable efforts, in cooperation with troop- and police-contributing countries and other Member States, to strengthen and standardize its training requirements. In approving the recommendations of the Senior Advisory Group, the General Assembly endorsed that immediate and enhanced priority be given to predeployment training for troops and police being sent to peacekeeping operations and that systems should be put in place to ensure effective monitoring of predeployment training.

48. Noting the difficulties involved in establishing a standard cost methodology for training across diverse systems and contexts, the questionnaire asked for details of all the United Nations peacekeeping-specific training provided to personnel before deploying and the costs involved according to general categories related to: instructors; materials; specialized equipment; facilities; and any other costs.

49. While a mandatory curriculum and standardized predeployment training programme, including for the assessment of personnel, are in place for formed police units, the situation regarding peacekeeping training for the military is more diverse. The United Nations core predeployment training modules provide a basic set of materials for United Nations peacekeeping and are widely used by Member States. In addition, the United Nations Infantry Battalion Manual offers additional guidance on the core skills and training that infantry personnel serving in United Nations peacekeeping are required to have. In addition, many troop-contributing countries develop their own curricula, including mission-specific simulations and exercises related to their own needs and based on the operational requirements of the mandate.

50. Since sample countries have their own national systems and requirements as well as differing histories and experiences of United Nations peacekeeping and they apply a variety of approaches to costing training, it has been a challenge to establish common and comparable costs in this category. The cost data in table 9 represents an average cost per person calculated by dividing the total costs provided by the sample country for the training given to the units deployed in March 2013 by the overall deployment strength, and then dividing that figure by the length of rotation. **The weighted average cost reflecting the proportionate size of the troop-contributing country contributions would amount to $148.30 (8.41 per cent of the overall cost across the sample countries) per person per month.**

51. This is the first time a troop cost survey has attempted to capture training costs at this level of detail. While the data raises some issues about comparability and standardization in collecting more information about the range and diversity of what is offered by troop- and police-contributing countries, the inclusion of training within the reimbursement framework represents an opportunity to understand better the kinds of costs incurred by contributing countries in providing United Nations predeployment training and the different approaches they take.

Cost data: other costs

52. In addition to the five mandated categories, the questionnaire requested information about any other costs. A range of different expenses were reported. In most cases, the expenditure was unique to one country and, therefore, could not be considered "common"; for example, "contingent allowances" paid to unit commanders for covering miscellaneous costs. Some reported costs related to the spouses and dependants of contingent members; neither of those costs could be considered essential to United Nations peacekeeping. Sample countries also observed that they incur post-deployment expenses, including inland demobilization costs and post-deployment medical exams.

53. These other costs are reported as significant troop- and police-contributing country investments, in line with their own national systems and commitments to the United Nations. The General Assembly may wish to consider adjusting the cost categories collected in future surveys. One additional cost reported by 9 out of the 10 sample countries was the cost of issuing passports. The General Assembly may wish to consider including this cost in future surveys.

B. Women in peacekeeping: additional factors relating to female contingents

54. Security Council resolution 1325 (2000) on women and peace and security is integrated into all United Nations peacekeeping mandates. Among other aspects, that resolution and subsequent Security Council resolutions call on Member States to ensure women's equal participation and full involvement in all efforts for the maintenance and promotion of peace and security, and urges all actors to increase the participation of women. The benefits of enhanced visibility of women in peace and security processes include creating enabling conditions for women's participation during all stages of peace processes and for countering negative societal attitudes regarding full and equal participation of women in conflict resolution and mediation.

55. The increased deployment of women peacekeepers is critical for, among other things: addressing the specific needs of female ex-combatants during the process of

demobilization and reintegration into civilian life; helping make the peacekeeping force approachable to women in the community; and broadening the skill set available within a peacekeeping mission.

56. The number of women uniformed peacekeepers has increased over the past four years, up from 2,939 women in January 2010 to 3,801 in January 2014. In March 2013, there were 3,552 female uniformed personnel deployed in United Nations peacekeeping operations. Women peacekeepers have different needs and requirements in terms of their personal kit and equipment and other aspects of deployment, including the need for dedicated accommodation and other facilities. To that end, the questionnaire requested specific information on costs associated with deploying female peacekeepers. Further description and context was also provided in the follow-up visits.

57. The following list indicates some of the specific costs, in each category, related to female deployment:

(a) Allowances: one sample country reported an additional allowance paid to female police as an incentive for deployment. Another country reported an additional travel allowance for female contingents to make it easier for them to maintain contact with their children;

(b) Personal kit and equipment: a number of sample countries reported on specific items of clothing provided to female contingents and police officers, such as specific regulation coats and shoes;

(c) Predeployment medical: countries providing female contingent members and police reported additional costs related to administering pregnancy tests and gynaecological exams;

(d) Training: specific accommodation and facilities costs were provided for training women, including separate accommodation and ablution facilities.

V. Additional elements

58. In its resolution 67/261, the General Assembly approved two additional premium payments that could potentially be paid to troop- and police-contributing countries. In his report on the implementation of the recommendations of the Senior Advisory Group on rates of reimbursement to troop-contributing countries and other related issues (A/67/713, paras. 32-51), the Secretary-General gave an overview of how those payments would be administered from July 2014. The amount that could be paid for each premium is limited by a ceiling established as a percentage of the overall amount budgeted for personnel reimbursement within a financial year. In the case of the "risk" premium, this ceiling is no greater than an amount equal to a 10 per cent premium paid to 10 per cent of the average number of contingent personnel deployed during the peacekeeping fiscal year (A/C.5/67/10, para. 112). Based on the current standard rate of reimbursement, this amount is approximately $13.3 million per year. In the case of enabling capacity, the ceiling is no greater than an amount equal to a 15 per cent premium paid to 20 per cent of the average number of contingent personnel deployed during the peacekeeping fiscal year, which would amount to approximately $40 million, based on current rates. This report updates and gives more detail on how the premiums will be implemented from 1 July 2014.

A. Premium for units operating without restrictions and caveats acquitting themselves well despite exceptional levels of risk ("risk" premium)

59. By its resolution 67/261, the General Assembly approved the recommendation of the Senior Advisory Group that the Secretary-General be authorized to award bonuses to individual units that are operating without restrictions and caveats imposed by troop- and police-contributing countries and that have acquitted themselves well despite exceptional levels of risk, that those awards would be paid at the conclusion of service directly to the relevant individual contingent members, and that the Secretary-General would decide on the awards on a quarterly basis.

60. The premiums will be awarded in line with the processes described in the Secretary-General's report (A/67/713, paras. 32-51). Recommendations to award the premium for risk will be based on quantitative and qualitative evidence drawn from existing sources of information and verified against contemporaneous reporting, such as situation reports and flash reports. Detailed operational factors to assess how and if those criteria apply will be shared with all field missions, supported by examples and definitions, for example of circumstances whereby a unit "acquits itself well". As stipulated in the recommendations of the Senior Advisory Group, to be eligible to receive this premium, units may not have restrictions and caveats placed on their operations by the contributing country. In making a recommendation for the premium, the Special Representative of the Secretary-General would need to include documented evidence that units are operating without restrictions or caveats.

61. The recommendation would be made at the unit level, and each member of the unit would be eligible for the financial bonus. The award of 10 per cent of the monthly reimbursement rate will be paid in respect of all actions taken within a calendar month. Given the exceptional nature of the award and the limited funds available, there would be no expectation that awards would be approved every quarter. In addition, the Secretary-General will award each member of the unit a non-monetary recognition through a special clasp to be affixed to the ribbon of the United Nations medal, and a letter of commendation from the Under-Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations.

62. The Office for the Strategic Peacekeeping Partnership will annually review the functioning, impact and application of the premium and make recommendations to the Under-Secretaries-General for Peacekeeping Operations and Field Support to strengthen and enhance the overall process, as might be required.

63. Once awarded, the calculation of the amount of the premium to be paid would be made by the Field Budget and Finance Division and reviewed by the Office of Programme Planning, Budget and Accounts to ensure that there are sufficient funds, within the established ceiling. Since the payment would in most cases be made at the mission level, disbursement of funds would be through the Director of Mission Support as part of the formal check-out process, using the existing mechanisms to disburse funds to individual uniformed personnel. In situations where the approval for the awarding of the premium for risk is granted following repatriation, United Nations Headquarters will make arrangements to pay the award through the Permanent Mission of the relevant troop- or police-contributing country. The implementation of this premium payment as part of the new reimbursement framework requires revised systems and processes so as to ensure consistency between operational and financial information and to ensure proper review and oversight of payment of the premium.

B. Premium for limited number of key enabling capacities

64. The General Assembly, by its resolution 67/261, approved the recommendation of the Senior Advisory Group that a premium be paid for the provision of a limited number of key enabling capabilities that are in high demand and short supply, and that the Secretary-General would decide from time to time and mission by mission which enabling capacities, if any, would qualify and the size of the premium in each case (see A/C.5/67/10, para. 114). According to the Senior Advisory Group, the annual aggregate amount of such premiums would be no greater than an amount equal to a 15 per cent premium paid to 20 per cent of the average number of contingent personnel deployed during the peacekeeping fiscal year.

65. The broad objective of this premium payment is to provide an additional incentive to contributing countries to address critical military and police gaps in United Nations peacekeeping operations. While the amount of the premium is linked to the level of personnel reimbursement, the critical gaps and capabilities required in United Nations missions necessarily involve both personnel and equipment, since in order to meet operational demands, one cannot operate without the other. Gaps identified by the Senior Advisory Group in the report included aviation units and level II and III hospitals. In addition, in paragraph 87 of its report, the Senior Advisory Group highlighted that securing the early provision of enablers at the outset of a mission is critical in developing early capability and allows for quicker deployment of all other components. Ongoing mission reviews of the Departments of Peacekeeping Operations and Field Support support the conclusion that the main operational gap is the absence of enough enablers at mission start up or surge in order to allow for fast deployment. Experience over the past 12 months, in particular in starting a new mission in Mali and, most recently, in moving contingents and formed police units to South Sudan also suggests that inter-mission cooperation is an area of potential capacity gaps where a premium might be helpful to deployment, where troop- and police-contributing countries are asked to move contingents between missions at short notice and with minimal constraints. The premium for enabling capacity will be awarded for those pre-identified capabilities that can rapidly deploy.

66. The amount of the premium to be paid for enabling capacity to the contributing country would be determined on the basis of how fast the capability can be provided starting from the date of United Nations acceptance of the contribution. Troop- and police-contributing countries will be awarded an incremental premium of 25, 15 and 10 per cent of the total annual reimbursement rate — both personnel and equipment — for, respectively, the 30-, 60-, 90-day deployment of the unit concerned. The premium will be paid as a lump sum as part of the personnel reimbursement, after the first quarter of deployment and calculated on the basis of a one-year maximum of the actually paid reimbursement rate for contingent-owned equipment and contingent personnel for a standard unit of the same type. The annual ceiling for the premium is tied to the overall annual personnel reimbursement. Based on the current standard rate of reimbursement this ceiling would amount to approximately $40 million. In order to provide a meaningful incentive for the rapid deployment of enabling capacities, the calculation of the amount of the premium would be based on both the personnel and equipment reimbursement for the unit concerned. As an indication, the approximate annual reimbursement for a standard engineering unit is $27.9 million ($13.34 million for personnel and $14.54 million for equipment). A 25 per cent premium for the deployment of the unit within

30 days would amount to $6.9 million. The premium would be disbursed as a one-time payment through the personnel reimbursement system.

67. The actual amount of the premium would be validated through the mission verification reports that will confirm the arrival of personnel and contingent-owned equipment to the mission area, and the actual delivery of the intended capability. Prevailing mechanisms and procedures for reimbursement would be followed for the one-year premium or will be prorated in cases where the actual deployment is less than one year.

68. Regular monitoring and reporting mechanisms will ensure fairness, equity and transparency in awarding the premiums to troop- and police-contributing countries. The implementation of this new process — closely linking force generation and logistics to operational decision-making and finance — will demand considerable new work. In developing the processes for implementing this premium, regular coordination and communication mechanisms have been established and will need to be enhanced from 1 July 2014.

69. The impact of the premium on the operational effectiveness and the force generation process would be reviewed annually, including if so requested, by the Office for the Peacekeeping Strategic Partnership.

C. Funding of the premiums

70. The premiums are new payments approved by the General Assembly in its resolution 67/261. As such, dedicated funding would be needed to pay the premiums, if awarded. It is proposed that funding for the awarding of the premium for risk and the premium for key enablers come from the establishment of a centrally managed fund. This fund would need to have an established level of $53.4 million, at the current standard rate of personnel reimbursement (total of premium for risk and premium for enabling capacity) or the equivalent percentages of any revised personnel reimbursement rate.

71. A dedicated fund would allow more transparency and oversight of the payment of the premiums. A financial performance report would be provided annually to the General Assembly in the context of the report on the overview of the financing of peacekeeping operations. Taking into account the concerns of Member States regarding new assessments, this mechanism would allow for the funding of the premiums while minimizing new assessments on Member States by allowing the use of unencumbered balances and other income and adjustments of peacekeeping operations.

72. Should the General Assembly so approve, the fund would be established, by 30 June 2014, and would be available in the fiscal year 2014/15. For the initial establishment of the fund in 2014/15, unencumbered balances would be applied. In the following year, the fund would be replenished, as necessary and, where possible, through unencumbered balances and other income and adjustments of the missions. The fund would be replenished at the end of each financial year, in line with the standard rate of reimbursement, to ensure that the maximum aggregate amounts approved by the General Assembly were maintained and available for the Secretary-General to award the premiums in each financial year. Appropriate accounting procedures will ensure that the funds are effectively managed throughout the

12-month financial period within the approved financial ceiling of the respective fiscal year.

D. Deduction to personnel reimbursement in relation to absent or non-functioning major equipment

73. The General Assembly, in its resolution 67/261, approved proportional deductions to personnel reimbursement in respect of absent or non-functioning major equipment. The resolution put in place a number of parameters for applying this deduction. The application of the resolution has been implemented in line with the specific provisions of the resolution, specifically:

(a) No deduction will be applied until after two consecutive unsatisfactory quarterly contingent-owned equipment verification reports, and in any case, not before 31 October 2013, in order to provide contributing countries with sufficient opportunity to address shortfalls;

(b) No deduction will be made for major equipment that is absent or non-functional for reasons deemed by the Secretariat to be beyond the control of the troop- or police-contributing country;

(c) No deduction will be made related to absent or non-functional vehicles unless over 10 per cent of the vehicles specified in relevant memorandums of understanding are absent or non-functional;

(d) Deduction on account of absent or non-functional contingent-owned equipment shall not exceed 35 per cent of reimbursements for any unit in any case.

74. In implementing the resolution, troop- and police-contributing countries were given two full, consecutive quarterly verification periods to address shortfalls (June-September and October-December 2013). The first deductions will be applied in cases where there continue to be shortfalls between the operational requirements of the line item specified in the memorandum of understanding and that of the quarterly verification report in the period January to March 2014. In those cases, a deduction will be made to the personnel reimbursement for the unit concerned. To ensure consistency in application and uniformity in performance reporting by peacekeeping missions, for a line item of major equipment to be declared "unsatisfactory", the equipment as specified in the memorandum of understanding would have been absent or non-functional for at least 10 per cent of the time in a three-month quarterly reporting period. A line item accounts for all individual items of the same type of category, for example a Jeep (4 x 4) with military radio, rather than an individual piece of equipment. The totality of the equipment within the line item would need to be judged "unsatisfactory" for two consecutive quarters before any deduction to personnel reimbursement would apply. This 10 per cent threshold was decided by the General Assembly in relation to vehicles. The rationale for the 10 per cent threshold is that the presence and functionality of a line item that falls below 90 per cent has a significant negative impact on operations; i.e., the military/police functions cannot be satisfactorily performed without additional cost to the United Nations (either financially and/or through diminished ability to perform some mandated tasks). The 10 per cent threshold provided by the General Assembly in relation to vehicles has therefore provided a benchmark to define performance for other categories of major equipment.

75. In addition, equipment that was absent or non-functional for reasons beyond the control of the contributing country will not be taken into account when calculating any deductions to personnel reimbursement. Guidelines for field missions on how to assess circumstances determined to be "beyond the control" have been issued to facilitate verification reports for the period of implementation. The guidelines provide definitions and detailed examples of situations and circumstances that would indicate that the absence/non-functional status was beyond the control of the troop- and police-contributing country. Such conditions include natural disasters, hostile action and damage during transport or delays at customs.

76. Taking into consideration that the first quarter for which deductions to personnel reimbursement being applied is January-March 2014, it is not possible to report on the financial implications until after the contingent-owned equipment verification reports have been processed in May 2014. Further detailed information can be provided to the General Assembly during its consideration of this report.

77. Since May 2013, 16 countries have also formally requested amendments to their memorandums of understanding to remove equipment that is not in the mission area and/or adjust equipment to ensure that it is in line with current operational requirements. Accordingly, memorandums of understanding for 45 separate units have either been amended or are in the final process of assessment with military, police and/or logistics experts, to ensure that the requested revisions are in accordance with operational requirements.

VI. Action to be taken by the General Assembly

78. **The General Assembly is requested to:**

(a) **Take note of the report of the Secretary-General;**

(b) **Express appreciation to the sample countries for their participation in the survey;**

(c) **Review the rates of reimbursement to countries contributing uniformed personnel to United Nations peacekeeping;**

(d) **Establish a dedicated fund to finance the payment of premiums to contributing countries for enabling capabilities and for units that have acquitted themselves well in spite of exceptional levels of risk, at a level of $53.4 million or the equivalent percentages of any revised personnel reimbursement rate;**

(e) **Decide that the fund should be funded by applying a portion of the unencumbered balances and other income and adjustments of active peacekeeping operations for the financial period 2012/13;**

(f) **Decide that the fund shall be replenished through the unencumbered balances and other income and adjustments of the financial period where the premiums have been awarded.**